## REMARKS

### Present Status of the Application

The Office Action rejected some presently pending claims 15-19. Specifically, the Office Action rejected claims 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 6,776,880) in view of Burrows et al. (US 6,013,538). The Office Action also rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 6,776,880) in view of Burrows et al. (US 6,013,538) as applied to claims 1, 10 and 15, and further in view of Watanabe et al. (US 2002/0017864). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and reconsideration of those amended claims is respectfully requested.

### Discussion of Office Action Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 6,776,880) in view of Burrows et al. (US 6,013,538). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Independent claim 15 recites the features as follows:

> 15. A mass-production packaging means suitable for mass-production packaging of an organic luminescent display, comprising at least :
> a sizing system having at least two sizing heads, which are used to apply a molding compound on a surface of the organic electroluminescent display panel;
> ***an alignment/lamination/UV irradiation system used to align the lid with the organic electroluminescent display panel to perform lamination, and provide UV light to cure the molding compound;***

a transportation system used to convey the organic electroluminescent display panel to the sizing system and the alignment/lamination/UV irradiation system in a continuous way; and

an atmosphere control system used to control water vapor and oxygen content in the packaging means.

(emphasis added).

In the 2nd OA, the Examiner asserts that Yamazaki does not appear to disclose a lid alignment system for applying a metal lid. Further, the Examiner asserts that Burrows utilize a lid alignment system (Column. 2, Lines 20-39) for applying a metal lid (Column. 6, Lines 37-44).

It should be noted that, instead of ***an alignment system***, ***an alignment/lamination/UV irradiation system*** is recited in Claim 15. The ***alignment/lamination/UV irradiation system*** recited in Claim 15 is ***used to align the lid with the organic electroluminescent display panel to perform lamination, and provide UV light to cure the molding compound***. Obviously, the Examiner ignores the difference between the ***alignment system*** and the ***alignment/lamination/UV irradiation system***. Furthermore, in re Col. 2, lines 20-39 of Burrows (US 6,013,538), only a process of forming the protective cap 118 is mentioned, but no disclosure relevant to "***alignment/lamination/UV irradiation system***" or other equipments is discussed. Prima Facie Case of obviousness is thus not established.

In re column 6, lines 22-26 of US 6,013,538, Burrows discloses that "Angular deposition may be accomplished by any technique that allows the material of the protective caps 118 to deposit into undercut 115c and completely cover organic layer(s) 116 and top electrode 117". In the disclosure above, Applicants assert that the means for performing angular deposition

disclosed by Burrows has alignment function only, but the means for performing angular deposition can not laminate a lid with the organic electroluminescent display panel and provide UV to cure a sealant which adheres between the lid and the organic electroluminescent display panel. As described above, Applicants assert that there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Yamazaki's disclosure and Burrows' disclosure. Even the disclosures are combined, the result is not substantially identical or similar with the Claim 15.

Dependent claim 19 recites the features as follows:

> 19. The mass-production packaging means of claim 15, wherein the molding compound is an UV paste.

In re paragraph [0469] of Watanabe et al., "After the paste has been cured by means of heat or ultraviolet rays, the cured paste is taken out of the mold and sintered to thereby simultaneously forming the **transparent barrier ribs and the transparent dielectric layer**. On this occasion, the thickness of the transparent dielectric layer is determined depending on the pressure and pressing time by the flat press or roll press, as well as on the hardness of the paste". The **transparent barrier ribs and the transparent dielectric layer** disclosed by Watanabe et al. are utilized to define discharge spaces in the PDP, but not for packaging the OEL devices. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 15 patently define over the prior art references, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 16-19 patently define over the prior art as well.

**Application No.: 09/852,188** **Docket No.: JCLA6418**

## CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 15-19 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
J.C. PATENTS

Date: 10/5/2005

Jiawei Huang
Registration No. 43,330

4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761
Fax: (949)-660-0809